

UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY

HIST480: Category One

2019

THE YORKIST SCRIBE:

His motivations and the objectives behind his edit of the Canterbury Roll

'This dissertation is submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of BA Honours in History at the University of Canterbury. This dissertation is the result of my own work. Material from the published or unpublished work of other historians used in the dissertation is credited to the author in the footnote references. The dissertation is approximately 9919 words in length.'

NATASHA JANE MCKAY

Supervised by Dr. Chris Jones

Abstract

The Canterbury Roll is a genealogical manuscript that traces the line of English succession from Edward IV to Noah. It originates from the fifteenth century and was edited by four subsequent scribes between 1429 and 1485. This five-meter long roll in its earliest form displays political ideas and is an example of how fifteenth century men and women viewed both these ideas and their history. While a later edition of the manuscript embodies the political upheaval caused by the Wars of the Roses and helps to provide an understanding of the political ideas in this period. This dissertation will look at these ideas through the Yorkist Scribe who is one of the four scribal hands on this manuscript, considering what his edit can say about his ideas on the right of succession and kingship. It compares both the visual and textual evidence on the roll with contemporary ideas and events to distinguish what the Yorkist Scribe's motivations and objectives were. While also providing a comparison of the scribal hands on the roll to distinguish how the Yorkist Scribes work differs from others on the manuscript, allowing the nature of his authorial voice to be determined. This dissertation provides a thorough analysis of these issues, multiple examples of the Yorkist Scribe working to not only to display a legitimate line of succession for the Yorkist line but also to delegitimise the Lancastrian line. It also helps to establish that it is unlikely that he was copying from another manuscript and the objectives the Yorkist Scribes had during his edit on the Canterbury Roll.

Contents page

ABSTRACT.....	3
CONTENTS PAGE	5
ABBREVIATIONS	7
INTRODUCTION	3
CHAPTER ONE: THE AUTHORIAL VOICE OF THE YORKIST SCRIBE.	2
CHAPTER TWO: THE YORKIST SCRIBE’S CONCEPT OF KINGSHIP.	2
CHAPTER THREE: THE IDEA OF SUCCESSION AND THE CREATION OF THE YORKIST GENEALOGY.....	2
CONCLUSION.....	3
BIBLIOGRAPHY	2

Abbreviations

Within this dissertation the CRN and CRC numbering system has been used for any reference made to the Canterbury Roll. This numbering system is used on the Canterbury Roll Digital edition, which is currently available online.¹ The abbreviations CRC stands for Canterbury Roll Commentary Number and CRN stands for Canterbury Roundel Number. These abbreviations are then followed by a number which directly cites the roundel or piece of commentary that is being referred to, which is available in both its Latin and translated English form by Elizabeth Rolston on the digital edition of the Canterbury Roll.

¹ “The Canterbury Roll – A Digital Edition,” *The Canterbury Roll Project*, accessed October 17, 2019, <http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll>.

Introduction

The Yorkist Scribe is one of the four scribal hands to edit the Canterbury Roll, which is a genealogical text originating from the fifteenth century.¹ Its genealogy traces both the English line of succession and the descent of Noah (CRN001) through to Edward IV of England (CRN589). Originally this genealogy stretched over the five-metre long manuscript and encompassed a mix of historical, semi-legendary and mythical figures² to show the Lancastrian line of succession. From this point, the genealogical roll was altered by the Yorkist Scribe to make a Yorkist genealogy. This dissertation will focus on the range of visual and textual evidence incorporated around the central line that extended the length of the manuscript with an emphasis on the thirty-two roundels³ and twelve new pieces of commentary that the Yorkist Scribe added. An analysis of this material and the use of comparison to other scribal hands on the roll will allow the motivations and objectives behind the Yorkist Scribe's edit to be examined. The intention is to determine why the Yorkist Scribe felt the need to turn a once Lancastrian genealogy into one that legitimised the Yorkist family line, the broader significance behind his edit and if there is more to this Yorkist genealogy than propaganda as Alison Allan suggests.⁴

This dissertation's study of the Yorkist Scribe's motivations and the objectives behind his edit on the Canterbury Roll is possible due to a change of opinion concerning the importance

¹ Chris Jones, "The Canterbury Roll" in *Treasures of the University of Canterbury Library*, ed Chris Jones et al. (Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press, 2011), 84.

² Jones, "The Canterbury Roll", 85.

³ Thandi Parker, "Roll Call: The motivations behind the inclusion of women on the Canterbury Roll" (Unpublished BA Hons dissertation, University of Canterbury, 2016), 34.

⁴ See Alison Allan, 'Royal Propaganda and the Proclamations of Edward IV' in *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 59, (1986): 146 – 154., Alison Allan, 'Political Propaganda Employed by the House of York in England in the Mid- Fifteenth Century, 1450–1471', unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Wales, 1981., Alison Allan, "Yorkist Propaganda: Pedigree, Prophecy and the "British History" in the Reign of Edward IV," in *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, edited by Charles Ross. (Gloucester: Rowman & Littlefield, 1979.), 171–92.

of chronicles and genealogical rolls. Formerly, historians such as Leopold von Ranke held a negative view of chronicles, believing they obstructed the historian's ability to determine the truth due to their biased nature.⁵ This is because chronicles can be seen as both primary and secondary sources in one document and hold the possibility of any commentary added having been completed for a political purpose.⁶ Burrow suggests, this allows the distinction between primary and secondary sources to become blurred in these documents as, "A document that is secondary in one kind of inquiry may be primary in another."⁷ The idea of commentary being used for political purpose has a direct link to the commentary added to the Canterbury Roll by the Yorkist Scribe, who was attempting to try and sway political opinion in favour of the Yorkists. Genealogical rolls, in particular, were rejected by an earlier generation of historians such as Charles Lethbridge Kingsford as having no value.⁸ A change has occurred since this with a new interest being taken in the study of genealogical chronical rolls. Olivier de Laborderie suggesting that the lack of concern for these genealogical rolls is due to the historical value of them being unappreciated and the absence of an awareness of the number of rolls in existence.⁹ The appreciation of genealogical rolls as sources has grown, with Michael Clanchy proposing that they would be an interesting source for understanding how literate men and women in medieval England viewed their history at the time.¹⁰ The changing views of chronicles and genealogical rolls allows for research to be undertaken in these areas and in turn opens the door for research on the Canterbury Roll to be pursued.

⁵ John Burrow, *A History of Histories* (London: Penguin, 2007), 463.

⁶ Burrow, *A History of Histories*, 463.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 463.

⁸ Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century: With an Appendix of Chronicles and Historical Pieces Hitherto for the most part unprinted*. (New York: Burt Franklin, 1913), 164.

⁹ Olivier de Laborderie, "A new pattern for English History: The first genealogical rolls of the Kings of England." In *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Medieval Britain and France*, edited by Raluca L. Radulescu et al. (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2008), 45.

¹⁰ As noted in Laborderie, "A new pattern for English History: The first genealogical rolls of the Kings of England.", 45 – 46.

The Canterbury Roll is a relatively unstudied manuscript from the fifteenth century. It was initially known as the Maude Roll and was researched by Arnold Wall in 1919.¹¹ Since this publication, a newfound interest in chronicle roll manuscripts has emerged with historians such as Alison Allan who examined rolls in the 1970s and 1980s for her research on Yorkist propaganda. Allan's work consisted of three contributions.¹² However, since Allan's work the Yorkist Scribe has not been studied, leaving a gap in the historiography due to the new material, information and approaches now available.

Allan's research focuses on the textual evidence surrounding Yorkist propaganda, and although she refers to the Canterbury Roll, it is not the specific focus of her work. This dissertation will build on current research with an emphasis on solely the Yorkist edit on the Canterbury Roll. The particular niche this dissertation will focus on fills a gap in the current historiography as it allows an in-depth focus on the motivations and objectives during the process of the Yorkist edit on this manuscript.

Since the work completed by Arnold Wall (1919), Allison Allan (1970s to 1980s) and Robert Rouse (2007)¹³ research on the Canterbury Roll has increased through the Canterbury Roll project undertaken at the University of Canterbury. This project has increased the number of publications on the Canterbury Roll and begun building a more abundant historiography surrounding this specific manuscript. This recent research includes work by Chris Jones (2011), Maree Shirota (2015) and Thandi Parker (2016)¹⁴ and an online publication of the

¹¹ A. Wall *Handbook to the Maude Roll: Being a XVth century MS. Genealogy of the British and English Kings from Noah to Edward IV., with Marginal History*, (Christchurch: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1919), 6.

¹² See Allan, 'Royal Propaganda and the Proclamations of Edward IV'., Allan, 'Yorkist propaganda: Pedigree, prophecy and the 'British history' in the Reign of Edward IV'., Allan, 'Political Propaganda employed by the house of York in England in the Mid-Fifteenth Century, 1450-1471'.

¹³ Robert Rouse, "Inscribing Lineage: Writing and Rewriting the Maude Roll", in *Migrations: Medieval Manuscripts in New Zealand*, ed Samantha Hollis et al (Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), 108.

¹⁴ See Jones, "The Canterbury Roll", Parker, "Roll Call: The motivations behind the inclusion of women on the Canterbury Roll", Shirota, Maree. "Royal depositions and the 'Canterbury roll". *Parergon*, Vol. 32, No. 2,

Canterbury Roll manuscript in 2017.¹⁵ The recent work completed by Maree Shirota and Thandi Parker both display a new approach to examining genealogical chronicle rolls. Thandi Parker notes that Shirota was the first to use genealogical chronicle rolls as a way to examine political thought and that her work will continue to follow this approach.¹⁶ This dissertation follows this trend in using genealogical chronical rolls as a way to examine political ideas, however, it focuses solely on political thought and ideas surrounding the Yorkist Scribe and in turn Yorkist supporters.

This dissertation investigates the Yorkist Scribe's motivations and objectives behind the editing of the Canterbury Roll and the effect it had upon the manuscript. It uses as a basis the study of political events during the Wars of the Roses and the ideas surrounding royal succession and kingship in the fifteenth century, including the work of historians Philip Edwards and Ralph Alan Griffith¹⁷ to help establish the societal and political changes taking place around these edits. This builds on the extensive research already completed on the Yorkist Scribe by Alison Allan, who focuses on the use of Yorkist propaganda. More recent work on the Canterbury Roll has focused on the inclusion of women on the Roll by Thandi Parker who looks at the attitudes of the scribes towards them.¹⁸ Maree Shirota's two works looked at political themes and thought and the way deposition is depicted on the Canterbury Roll.¹⁹

(2015): 39-61, Maree Shirota, 'Unrolling History: Fifteenth-Century Political Culture and Perceptions of the Canterbury Roll.' (unpublished MA thesis. University of Canterbury, 2015).

¹⁵ Jones, "The Canterbury Roll – A Digital Edition," The Canterbury roll project, <http://canterburyroll.canterbury.ac.nz/o>.

¹⁶ Parker, "Roll Call: The motivations behind the inclusion of women on the Canterbury Roll, 15.

¹⁷ See Philip Edwards, *The Making of a Modern English State, 1460 – 1660*. (New York: Palgrave, 2001), Ralph Alan Griffiths, *The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), Griffiths, *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century*, (London: The Hambleton Press, 1991). Accessed on June 11, 2019, 86.

¹⁸ See Parker, "Roll Call: The motivations behind the inclusion of women on the Canterbury Roll".

¹⁹ See Shirota, "Royal depositions and the 'Canterbury roll'", Shirota, 'Unrolling History: Fifteenth-Century Political Culture and Perceptions of the Canterbury Roll.'

Methodology

A comparative approach will be undertaken in this dissertation through a comparison of the Yorkist Scribe to the other scribal hands on the roll to establish his purpose in completing this edit. The first of these other scribes was the Lancastrian Scribe who worked on this manuscript between 1429 and 1433.²⁰ The Lancastrian Scribe was responsible for the majority of work completed on the Canterbury Roll, much of which was assembled by the original Roll-maker from other sources.²¹ Chris Jones suggests that the work of this scribe may be nothing more than a copy of an existing Noah manuscript.²² Three subsequent scribes then edited the Canterbury Roll. These were the Roman Numerals Scribe between 1433 and 1461,²³ the Yorkist Scribe between 1463 and 1468 and the Margret of Burgundy Scribe after 1483 and most likely before the fall of the Yorkist house in 1485.²⁴

Thandi Parkers used a comparative methodology to determine the attitudes of the first three scribes concerning women who abided by the fifteenth-century expectations of them and those who did not conform to them.²⁵ From this comparison Parker was able to determine that the Roman Numerals Scribe only added Roman numerals to the roundels of women whose sons became king, distinctly choosing not to acknowledge women who were not essential to the central line.²⁶ This demonstrates the importance of such comparisons as the differences are invaluable to understanding the manuscript in its entirety and can reveal the

²⁰ Maree Shiota, "The Wars of the Roses," *Canterbury Roll Project*, published 2015, accessed 19th September 2019, <http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/warroses.shtml>.

²¹ Parker, "Roll Call: The motivations behind the inclusion of women on the Canterbury Roll", 12.

²² Jones, "The Canterbury Roll", 88.

²³ The Canterbury Roll Project. "Origins". Accessed 2 October, 2019, <https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/Origin/>.

²⁴ Maree Shiota, "The Yorkist Revision," accessed September 19th, 2019, <https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/yorkist.shtml>.

²⁵ Parker, "Roll Call: The motivations behind the inclusion of women on the Canterbury Roll", 17.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 39.

societal and political changes occurring during and between these scribal edits. A comparative method will be used in this dissertation, using a comparison of the work completed by the Lancastrian Scribe (Original Scribe), the Yorkist Scribe and the Roman Numeral Scribe. This comparison will help to determine the way the Yorkist Scribe thought about political ideas such as succession and kingship and the nature of his authorial voice.

In addition, an analysis of the visual and textual evidence on the Canterbury Roll will take place, with this manuscript being considered as both a text and an object. The use of multiple scribes on one manuscript as a comparison and considering this manuscript as an object works to fill a gap in Alison Allan's previous methodology. This methodology focused on a textual analysis of genealogies, Yorkist bills, the proclamations of Edward IV and Yorkist poetry, to name a few sources used in her study of Yorkist propaganda.²⁷ This dissertation builds upon this method by using an analysis of both the visual and textual evidence on the Canterbury Roll to determine further motivations and objectives behind the Yorkist genealogy.²⁸ The newfound interest in the visual evidence contained on these manuscripts allows this dissertation to follow a different methodology than Alison Allan's work, which focused on textual evidence. This method of considering both the visual imagery on the roll and the manuscript itself is possible due to the emergence in the 1990s of the opinion that these sources hold vital evidence to help us understand the past.²⁹ Lipton argues that visual evidence is instrumental at helping us understand the medieval ages, considering the proportion of society who were illiterate and can provided insight into topics that written

²⁷ See Allan, 'Royal Propaganda and the Proclamations of Edward IV'., Allan, 'Yorkist propaganda: Pedigree, prophecy and the 'British history' in the Reign of Edward IV'., Allan, 'Political Propaganda employed by the house of York in England in the Mid-Fifteenth Century, 1450-1471'.

²⁸ See Allan, 'Royal Propaganda and the Proclamations of Edward IV'., Allan, 'Yorkist propaganda: Pedigree, prophecy and the 'British history' in the Reign of Edward IV'., Allan, 'Political Propaganda employed by the house of York in England in the Mid-Fifteenth Century, 1450-1471'.

²⁹ Sarah Lipton, "Images and objects as sources for medieval history", in *Understanding Medieval Primary Sources, Using historical sources to discover medieval Europe*, ed Joel. T Rosenthal. (New York: Routledge, 2012), 225.

sources did not touch on.³⁰ The importance of visual evidence on the Canterbury Roll is significant due to the number of people unable to read this document. Examples of this visual evidence include the massive white rose surrounding Edward IV's roundel (CRN589) and the decision to change the colour of the central line, both of which will be touched on in later chapters. These images help build on the information given to us in the textual evidence and allows us to consider what this visual imagery was meant to represent.³¹

This method will help to determine through comparison the way the Yorkist Scribe thought about political ideas such as succession and kingship and the nature of his authorial voice. Considering the visual aspects will establish the way the Yorkist Scribe went about creating his genealogy, while also helping to build on the Yorkist Scribe's thought process.

The first chapter compares the Yorkist Scribe to the Lancastrian Scribe and Roman Numerals Scribe, focusing on the nature of their authorial voices. This work will determine how scribes editing the same document can produce versions that contain such differing authorial voices. The nature of the Yorkist Scribes authorial voice will then be applied to looking at how he shapes history and in turn, what he is trying to achieve by shaping history in this manner.

The determination of the nature of the Yorkist Scribe's authorial voice will then be built on with an analysis of the information he has added to the roll in the second chapter. This analysis will establish the way the Yorkist Scribe thought about kingship and what makes a good king.

³⁰ Lipton, "Images and objects as sources for medieval history", 225

³¹ Ibid., 225 – 238.

Chapter three will consider the way the Yorkist Scribe differed from the Lancastrian Scribe in creating his genealogy and dealing with the idea of succession. This is done through a detailed investigation of the thirty-two roundels and twelve new pieces of commentary that the Yorkist Scribe added to the current lineage, turning a once Lancastrian document into a Yorkist document. The use of visual evidence is enormously important with the Yorkist Scribe's distinct change in the visual aspects of the roll holding direct links into the way he created his genealogy.

This dissertation will work to determine the Yorkist Scribe's motivations and the objectives behind his edit of the Canterbury Roll. This will be accomplished by determining the nature of the Yorkist Scribe's authorial voice on the roll in comparison to the other scribal hands. From here, it will be possible to consider his stance on political ideas of the time to reveal not only his motivations for undertaking this edit but his goals in doing so.

Chapter One: The Authorial Voice of the Yorkist Scribe.

When comparing both the original work of the Lancastrian Scribe and the later edit by the Roman Numeral Scribe to the Yorkist Scribe's latter contribution, the most apparent distinction between them is their differing authorial voices. The question becomes: how can scribes editing the same document have such differing authorial voices, and what is the nature of the Yorkist Scribe's authorial voice? Is he purposefully trying to shape history in a different way than the Lancastrian Scribe, and what is he trying to achieve through editing the Canterbury Roll? These questions will be discussed in this chapter.

Through a detailed analysis of the scribes of the Canterbury Roll and the effect their work had on the manuscript, the reader can consider the differing nature of their authorial voices. From this, one could infer that the Roman Numeral Scribe's authorial voice is possibly the most distinctive of the four. This is despite the fact that the Roman Numerals Scribe's work on the manuscript is less extensive than that of the Lancastrian and Yorkist Scribes; the Roman Numerals Scribe only added the Roman numerals to the roundels on the roll. Studies on the Roman Numeral Scribe have revealed that he chose not to acknowledge women who were not important to the central line and kings who went against the church,¹ exhibiting his authorial voice by demonstrating to the reader his key views on women and kings who went against the church. The Yorkist Scribe's authorial voice is similar to this, with the Yorkist Scribe providing what seems to be his personal opinion about the rightful king of England and the issues surrounding the Lancastrian and Yorkist claims to the throne. In this instance, the Yorkist Scribe uses phrases such as "violently deposed" (CRC127), "usurped the aforementioned crowns" (CRC127) and "violently and unjustly took upon themselves and

¹ Thandi Parker, The Canterbury Roll Project. "The Roman Numerals Scribe". Accessed August 7, 2019, <https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/romannumerals.shtml>.

occupied the kingdom and crowns of France and England” (CRC128) to describe the Lancastrian kings, whom he did not believe held the right to be king. The Roman Numerals Scribe, on the other hand, chose to add two years to the reign of Edward III, even though the Lancastrian Scribe had only listed fifty years, suggesting he believed Edward III’s reign started before his father had been removed from the throne.² The question here is why. One suggestion is that it includes the last years of his father’s reign, due to the fact that Edward II’s deposition paralleled the deposition of Richard II when the Lancastrians removed him from power.³ Another suggestion by Thandi Parker is that it coincides with Edward II’s wife Isabella leaving him.⁴ However, it was in March 1325 that Isabella left for France, and by the end of March, she had told her husband Edward II that she would not be returning,⁵ placing this event a few months before the start of our regnal years. The reasoning behind the Roman Numerals Scribe’s decision to extend Edward III’s reign is unclear due to the multitude of ways he could have constructed his dates. Regnal years is a dating system that starts with the establishment of a new reign, which could include the coronation of the new king or the death of the previous king and continues to the end of their reign.⁶ In regard to Edward III, he ruled for fifty-one regnal years, rather than the fifty listed by the Lancastrian Scribe, with his reign extending from 25 January 1327 to 21 June 1377.⁷ It is also important to be aware that the medieval new year commenced on 25 March,⁸ meaning that in the fifteenth century, Edward III’s reign was considered 25 January 1326 to 21 June 1377. However, this period is still only fifty-one regnal years, so at a minimum, the Roman Numerals Scribe has decided to add one

² Parker, “The Roman Numerals Scribe”. Accessed August 27, 2019, <https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/romannumerals.shtml>.

³ Parker, “The Roman Numerals Scribe”. Accessed August 27, 2019, <https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/romannumerals.shtml>.

⁴ Parker, “Roll Call: The motivations behind the inclusion of women on the Canterbury Roll”, 33.

⁵ Seymour Phillips, *Edward II*. (London: Yale University Press, 2010), 483 – 484.

⁶ C. R. Cheney and Michael Jones, ed. *A Handbook of Dates for Students of British History*. Rev ed. (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 4 – 21.

⁷ Cheney and Jones, *A Handbook of Dates for Students of British History*, 34.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 12.

year to Edward III's reign. From this decision, one could draw the inference that he is choosing to extend Edward III's reign to provide overlap in the reigns of Edward II and Edward III, implying that Edward III held more of a right to kingship during these years than his father. This may be due to Edward III's role as keeper of the realm, which he undertook twice during this period. Edward III was first named keeper of the realm on 30 August 1325, by his father Edward II.⁹ Given that Edward III passed away on 2 June 1377,¹⁰ the extension of his reign to fifty-two years implies his reign would have begun between 3 June 1325 and 2 June 1326. Therefore, the appointment of Edwards III as keeper of the realm on 30 August 1325 coincides perfectly with the regnal years provided by the Roman Numerals Scribe. The second time Edward III was named keeper of the realm was at the hands of his mother, Isabella, on 26 September 1326, with Isabella claiming his father, Edward II had abandoned England,¹¹ thereby implying he was a bad king and her son Edward III was a better option. This provided the Roman Numeral Scribe with the opportunity to extend Edward III's reign, and through doing so, suggested Edward II did not show adequate kingship. The Roman Numeral Scribe alone displays the significant effect one's authorial voice can have on the Canterbury Roll, with his personal opinions on women and kings who went against the church being discovered by Thandi Parker.¹² The Roman Numeral Scribe demonstrates the importance of considering the authorial voices of scribes on the Canterbury Roll, with a considerable amount of information being exposed when considering only the Roman numerals on the Canterbury Roll. In comparison, the Yorkist Scribe and the Roman Numeral Scribe have distinct similarities when considering their authorial voices, with their personal

⁹ W. Mark. Ormrod, *Edward III*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 33.

¹⁰ Ibid, 577.

¹¹ W. M. Ormrod, "Edward III (1312 - 1377), king of England and lord of Ireland." in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. by Colin Matthew, et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23 Sept 2004.) Accessed 28 September 2019. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.christchurchcitylibraries.com/10.1093/ref:odnb/8519>.

¹² Parker, "The Roman Numerals Scribe". Accessed August 7, 2019, <https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/romannumerals.shtml>.

opinions about kings that they did not believe had the right to rule, being evident in their respective edits. The Yorkist Scribe's use of phrases as a way of delegitimising kings he did not believe had the right to rule is a significant illustration of his personal opinion. One must be cognisant that these phrases would have been chosen intentionally, much like the Roman Numerals Scribe's decision to deliberately extend Edward III's reign and ignore women who were not key to the central line and men who went against the church. Therefore, the importance of these phrases in understanding the authorial voice of the Yorkist Scribe is significant, as they represent his attempt to delegitimise the Lancastrian claim to the throne of England while pushing his Yorkist agenda and displaying his predisposition towards kingship.

One such example of the Yorkist Scribe using his fragments on the Roll as an attempt to push his Yorkist agenda can be seen when he proclaims that "This Roger, the true firstborn son of the named Lady Philippa, was then the closest heir apparent of the kingdoms of England and France and was proclaimed, held, and considered as such through the whole English nation." (CRC129). What the Yorkist Scribe fails to mention here is the dynastic issue with the line of succession at this time. Lady Philippa was the daughter of the second son of Edward III, and it was through her descendants along with the heirs of Edward III's fourth son that we have Richard, Duke of York and the Yorkist claim.¹³ The Lancastrian claim, on the other hand, comes through the third son and male heir of Edward III.¹⁴ This is where the dynastic issue comes into play, as although the line of succession in England generally went through eldest male heir, there was no law to say it could not pass through the female line at this time; in fact, the questions surrounding succession had not been established at this time in England.¹⁵

¹³ Edwards, *The Making of a Modern English State, 1460 – 1660*, 28.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 28.

This is a stark contrast to France during this period where Salic Law was in place, providing the French monarchy with a valid reason to prevent women from becoming part of royal succession,¹⁶ a valid reason that had been used only a few generations earlier when they extended this prohibition to males claiming descent through the female line.¹⁷ This is seen with Edward III, Philippa's grandfather being passed over despite his mother, Isabella, being sister to the recently deceased Charles IV.¹⁸ By failing to recognise this dynastic issue in England, the Yorkist Scribe can frame this information in a way that implies that Lady Philippa's son, Roger, was without a doubt the rightful and closest heir to the throne of England, and was accepted as such by the whole of England. This shows the Yorkist Scribe using his fragments on the roll to shape history in a manner that supports the Yorkist claim, in this case, he is shaping history to his benefit. This is because the Yorkist claim to the throne of England was made by Richard, Duke of York,¹⁹ who was a descendant of Roger; before this claim was made, the Lancastrian dynasty seemed to have been widely accepted amongst the noble families in England.²⁰ Once again, it is important to remember that the Yorkist Scribe chose to add this information to the roll on purpose. In this case, this information seems to have been framed to support the Yorkist agenda, as it does not seem likely that the Lancastrians would have been accepted as kings of England, if Roger was, in fact, considered by the whole of England to be the rightful heir. This demonstrates the Yorkist Scribe's manipulation of the information he is adding to the roll to try and shape history in a way that supports the Yorkist line of succession.

¹⁶ Craig Taylor, "The Salic Law, French Queenship, and the Defense of Women in the Late Middle Ages." *French Historical Studies*, Vol 29 Issue 4 (2006): 543 -544, accessed 29 Sept 2019. doi: 10.1215/00161071-2006-012.

¹⁷ Taylor, "The Salic Law, French Queenship, and the Defense of Women in the Late Middle Ages", 550.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 550.

¹⁹ Michael Hicks, *Edward IV*. (Great Britain: Arnold, 2004), 2.

²⁰ Edwards, *The Making of a Modern English State, 1460 – 1660*, 28.

A comparison to the original work of the Lancastrian Scribe exposes the contrasts between the authorial voices of these Yorkist and Lancastrian scribes and differences between their edits. The most likely reason for this contrast is that the Lancastrian Scribe's work on the Canterbury Roll had been assembled by the original Roll-maker from other chronicle sources. Arnold Wall found in his 1919 research that the works of William of Malmesbury, Gildas, Ranulph Higden, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Nennius, Rodger of Hoveden, Gerald of Wales and William of Newburgh were used in the compilation of the original Lancastrian content.²¹ The Yorkist Scribe, on the other hand, does not seem to have been a compiler and often seems to be providing his own opinion on the politics of the time, rather than copying from other sources. Lisa Rolston noticed during her translation of the Yorkist Scribe's work on the Canterbury Roll that he made several spelling and grammatical mistakes.²² She pointed out that the grammatical errors the Yorkist Scribe made on the roll include using an accusative rather than the nominative case in three roundels (CRN578, CRN580, CRN584).²³ That this mistake happens in three of the thirty-two roundels that the Yorkist Scribe added to the roll making it seem extremely unlikely that he was copying from any Latin chronicles or other chronical rolls. The fact that the Yorkist Scribe is most likely not copying from chronicle sources and is entirely focused on proving that the Yorkist line is the rightful line of succession to the throne of England is a clear demonstration of his authorial voice. Unlike the Lancastrian Scribe, the Yorkist Scribe's personal opinion is evident in the fragments he has added to the roll, in the same way as the Roman Numeral Scribe's is. If we take into account that it is extremely plausible that the Yorkist Scribe is writing his own opinions on this document and is not copying from others, it can, therefore, infer that he is actively trying to delegitimise the house of Lancaster while working to legitimise the new Yorkist king.

²¹Wall, *Handbook to the Maude Roll: Being a XVth century MS. Genealogy of the British and English Kings from Noah to Edward IV., with Marginal History*, 9.

²² Thank you Elizabeth Rolston for pointing this out to me.

²³ Thank you Elizabeth Rolston for pointing this out to me.

The Yorkist Scribe's authorial voice can also be seen in the imagery he adds to the Canterbury Roll. This imagery is used to differentiate the Yorkist genealogy from the Lancastrian line, and this can be seen through Edward IV's roundel on the Canterbury Roll (CRN589). A massive white rose surrounds this roundel, almost twice the size of the flourishes surrounding the last roundel on the central line of Henry V (CRN567) and three times the size of his predecessor Henry VI roundel (CRN568), which not only fails to receive any flourishes but is neglected from being featured on the central line. Instead, Henry VI is featured off to the right side, much like the children of kings who did not inherit the throne. This signifies the importance of Edward IV on the Canterbury Roll in comparison to his predecessor, who has been placed to the side as an indication of his lack of importance to the Yorkist edit. The detailing of the white rose surrounding Edward IV is more comparable to the roundels of Noah (CRN001), Brutus (CRN115) and Egbert (CRN392), signifying his importance as a finishing point for this genealogical manuscript and displaying his legitimacy and right to be king. Another possibility for the decorative features around the roundel of Edward IV is that the Yorkist Scribe is trying to link Edward to the likes of Brutus and Egbert, whose decorative crowns on the roll, Chris Jones has suggested, are signs of unification – with Brutus founding Britain and Egbert unifying England under the Anglo Saxons.²⁴ If this were indeed the case, this would suggest that the Yorkist Scribes goal is not only to differentiate the Yorkist King from his predecessors but also to infer Edward is unifying England under his rule. This is important to understanding the Yorkist Scribes authorial voice as this would suggest that he is trying to portray Edward IV as a unifying king to the viewers of this manuscript. This is significant when considering that he is working to

²⁴ Chris Jones, "The Canterbury Roll: A Case Study in a Contested Past" (research seminar presentation, University of Canterbury, Christchurch New Zealand, 6 March 2019).

do this in a society that has not only just gone through a civil war, with the Wars of the Roses, but also a shift in its dynastic power.

The Yorkist Scribe's authorial voice can, therefore, be seen through a comparison of his work to the work of the Lancastrian Scribe and the Roman Numerals Scribe. From this comparison, it becomes clear that the Yorkist Scribe does not seem to be copying from chronicles or another chronicle roll. This is because the Yorkist Scribe's opinion on the political events happening at the time is distinct, much like the Roman Numeral Scribe's opinion on women and kings who went against the church. Additionally, his grammatical errors seen in the roundels on the Canterbury Roll imply that he is most likely writing this information firsthand, rather than copying it from another source. This means that he is making the conscious decision to shape history a certain way as he is adding it to the roll and by only providing the information that supports his Yorkist king, he is purposely shaping history in the manner that suits his cause.

Chapter Two: The Yorkist Scribe's concept of Kingship.

Through a detailed analysis of the Yorkist Scribe's writing on the Canterbury Roll, it is possible to determine his views on kingship and what he believes makes a good king. From here, an examination of the way these beliefs may have affected the roll can be undertaken. This analysis is essential for understanding the twelve new pieces of commentary the Yorkist Scribe added to the Canterbury Roll and the societal ideas that are reflected in them. This, in turn, offers insight into the extent societal ideas and his own opinion of kingship may have affected his motivations and objectives during the Yorkist edit of the Canterbury Roll.

The Yorkist Scribe's opinion about kingship and what makes a good king is shown throughout his writing. The primary way his opinion on kingship is conveyed is through the idea of legitimacy and more subtly through his opinion on the right to be king. The idea of legitimacy is used both to claim the Lancastrians' lack of right to the English throne and also to support the Yorkist claim. Most noticeable of these is the Yorkist Scribe's writing on the Lancastrian family's lack of legitimacy, and this is shown in two different fragments added to the roll. The most blatant states:

This Henry of Darby, son of John of Gaunt, imprisoned Richard the true king of England and true heir of France, violently deposed him, and made himself to be accepted and named King Henry IV, and thus he and his heirs usurped the aforementioned crowns and occupied them, and became possessors in bad faith of the same. (CRC127).

The use of phrases in this fragment such as "violently deposed", "usurped," and "possessors in bad faith" draws attention to the need for legitimacy when holding kingship. During this

period the use of legitimacy is essential to hold kingship, as the deposition of Richard II is the first time the direct line of male succession was broken, since the beginning of 1216 and this deposition was the start of the reoccurring instability seen in England during the Wars of the Roses.¹ Beginning in 1216 a direct line of male succession had begun with there being only one occasion the English crown was not passed down from father to son, on this occasion it was from grandfather to grandson.² 1399 marked the first occasion in the last 183 years that the direct line of male succession was broken³ with Edmund, Earl of March, the closest male heir to Richard II after his deposition, being skipped over in favour of Henry IV.⁴ The inference drawn from this fragment is that Henry IV's succession to the throne of England was unlawful and therefore it was impossible for his line to hold legitimacy and by extension successfully exercise and maintain kingship. This conclusion is supported by the challenges Henry faced during his time as monarch. These included problems with rebels, parliaments and obtaining the financial support to run his government.⁵ However, more significantly he had to work to retain his position as king and to pass it on to his heirs.⁶

One aspect of kingship is the idea of kings receiving their authority from God, which developed throughout the middle ages.⁷ This belief that a king receives his power from god helps reinforce the idea of hereditary succession,⁸ as it was believed that with the death of a king his power and the protection that came with it reverted to God.⁹ The king was seen as

¹ Griffiths, *The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, 192.

² Ibid., 192.

³ Ibid., 192.

⁴ Anthony Tuck, *Richard II and the English Nobility* (London: Edward Arnold, 1973), 419.

⁵ S. B. Chrimes, *Lancastrians Yorkists and Henry VII*, (London: Macmillan & CO LTD, 1964), 38.

⁶ Ibid., 38.

⁷ Joseph Canning, *A History of Medieval Political Thought, 300 – 1450*. (USA, Canada: Routledge, 1996), 18 – 19.

⁸ Chris Given-Wilson, "Legitimation, Designation and Suggestion to the Throne in Fourteenth-Century England." In *Building Legitimacy: Political discourses and forms of legitimacy in medieval societies*, ed., Alfonso Anton et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 89.

⁹ Walter Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*. (Great Britain: Penguin Books, 1970), 135 – 136.

the upholder of law and order in his country: the death a ruling monarch meant a period without this protection, that was much limited by having a hereditary heir.¹⁰ This belief explains the tendency of individuals to accept this form of government, as having a hereditary heir provided them with a type of continuous government,¹¹ that offered the population certainty of continued leadership and in turn the protection of God through their king. This demonstrates one possible reason why the Yorkist Scribe pushed the idea of hereditary right on the Canterbury Roll and why it seems to be of such significance to him. If we were to consider Richard II as receiving his right to rule directly from God in a society where hereditary succession has taken place for many years, one could conclude that the Yorkist Scribe is inferring that through the usurpation of Richard's throne, Henry IV is unable to gain kingship. This is insinuated through the fragment of the Yorkist Scribe's commentary that states that he "made himself to be accepted and named King Henry IV"(CRC127), implying that Henry did this of his own volition and had no hereditary right to the throne and therefore was not lawful in the eyes of God.

When considering kingship on the Canterbury Roll as a whole, however, the Lancastrian Scribe's writing suggests that during the early fifteenth century legitimacy was not one of the most important aspects of kingship. Maree Shirota states that this compilation of information copied to the roll's commentary by the Lancastrian Scribe implies that: "Although blood succession was certainly preferred, conventional, and helpful for legitimisation, it was not a fundamental principle that determined succession to the throne."¹² It is implied that a king's ability to rule was more important and that it was the people's right to replace an ineffective king.¹³ This is an idea of kingship that the Roll Maker would be keen to establish in his

¹⁰ Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*, 135 – 136.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 135 – 136.

¹² Shirota, "Royal depositions and the 'Canterbury roll'", 61.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 61.

compilation of chronicle sources, due to the manner of Henry IV's ascension to the throne. This would be of particular importance to the Roll Maker as no direct justification was given for this usurpation,¹⁴ rather he attempts to influence future readers' views on kingship by providing them with a justification for dynastic changes. The Yorkist Scribe's edit shows an important shift from this due to his focus on hereditary right.

The Roll Maker's idea of the people's right to replace an ineffective king is not supported in the Yorkist Scribe's commentary; however, it is implied when he refers to Edward IV being elected by God and the voice of the people (CRC134). This idea is reflective of the Germanic customs and law, which promote the significance of a king's relationship with his people and emphasise the importance these people have on his reign as in the absence of his people's approval the ruler's authority would be diminished.¹⁵ The promotion of hereditary succession by the Yorkist Scribe not only provides the reader with a reasoning for the Lancastrian kings' lack of legitimacy due to their usurpation but by placing this fragment parallel to Henry IV's roundel on the roll, the Yorkist Scribe is distinguishing the exact moment the central line on the Canterbury Roll becomes illegitimate in his opinion.

The reference made by the Yorkist Scribe to Edward IV being elected in part by the people states:

And on the fourth day of March, through the greater and more sensible [part] of the people, was elected as king of England by the grace of God and the voice of those

¹⁴ Shiota, 'Unrolling History: Fifteenth-Century Political Culture and Perceptions of the Canterbury Roll', 75.

¹⁵ K. Pennington, "Law, Legislative Authority, and Theories of Government, 1150 – 1300." In *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought. c.350 – c.1450*, ed., J. H. Burns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), <https://doi-org.ezproxy.canterbury.ac.nz/10.1017/CHOL9780521243247>, 426 – 427.

[people], rising and receiving the kingdom of England in London for himself, by law so much as by inheritance, in the year of the Lord 1460. (CRC134).

This fragment reflects the crucial relationship between a king and his subjects, with Germanic customs and Christian beliefs expecting kings to rule for the latter's benefit. However, even though the Yorkist Scribe implies the importance of this relationship, it is clear that he views a king's relation to God as equally important if not more so, with the credit of Edwards accession being given to both God and the people (CRC134). The Yorkist Scribe yet again refers to the necessity of inheritance, by implying that Edward IV's inheritance right was just as important as English law for his establishment as king.

It is important to note, that the Yorkist Scribe does not dispute the importance of the relationship between a king and his subjects, even though this is part of the Roll Maker's argument as to why it is acceptable to replace an ineffective king.¹⁶ He instead insists that hereditary succession needs to be followed and by extension that the people did not have the right to replace an ineffective king if this did not follow hereditary right. This is implied when considering two of the Yorkist fragments added to the roll. The first suggests he was elected by god and the people (CRC134), while the second states that the Lancastrian line "violently and unjustly took upon themselves, and occupied the kingdom and the crowns of the kings of England and France" (CRC128). These two fragments contradict one another: one suggests the right of the people to elect their king, while the other is implying that the Lancastrians usurped the crown, not touching at all on the idea of the people's right to replace an ineffective king, which was an idea found by Thandi Parker in the Lancastrian Scribes'

¹⁶ Shirota, "Royal depositions and the 'Canterbury roll'", 61.

work.¹⁷ By not disputing this idea and also referring to the importance of the relationship between a king and his subjects, the Yorkist Scribe is focusing on the right of hereditary succession, rather than claiming that the people did not have the right to replace an ineffective king. This displays the importance of the way the relationship between king and subject was viewed during this period and by the people the Yorkist Scribe's work was likely to reach. Additionally, it explains the Yorkist Scribe's decision to leave the reasoning behind Richard II's deposition off the roll, as there would be no way for the Yorkist Scribe to dispute the removal of Richard II from the throne if, as Canning notes, Christian kings were indeed viewed as responsible for ruling in the interests of their people.¹⁸ This idea was not followed by Richard II when he chose to prevent the passing of inheritance from father to son, after the death of the future Henry IV's father, John of Gaunt, in February 1399.¹⁹ By confiscating these lands, Richard II was essentially claiming that he had right over the lands of his people and could do with them as he pleased.²⁰ This does not represent a king ruling for the benefit of his people and shows the importance the relationship between a king and his subjects had in terms of kingship, with both the edits of the Lancastrian Scribe and the Yorkist Scribe referring to it.

The Yorkist Scribe's opinion on what is needed to hold kingship comes across clearly. However, it is difficult to determine what he believes makes a good king through his writing. He puts a great deal of emphasis on one's legitimacy and one's right to rule to be able to hold kingship. Therefore, one might consider that to be a good king he believed that one must hold the right to be king, so consequently a king could not be someone who occupied crowns in bad faith or through usurpation, as he claims the Lancastrians did. An alternative would be

¹⁷ Ibid., 61.

¹⁸ Canning, *A History of Medieval Political Thought, 300 – 1450*, 18.

¹⁹ Anthony Steel, *Richard II*. (London: Cambridge University Press 1941), 248

²⁰ Tuck, *Richard II and the English Nobility*, 210.

that the Yorkist Scribe may agree with the current view on the roll of what makes a good king, and this would explain his silence on the subject other than to alter aspects of kingship that he does not believe are correct. This could help to explain why the Yorkist Scribe chose to undertake an edit of this roll, rather than make his own genealogical manuscript and provides significant insight as to why the Canterbury Roll as a document was able to be edited by multiple scribes. The Yorkist Scribes edit on the Canterbury Roll shows him correcting aspects of kingship that he does not believe are correct, therefore one could conclude that he would not have decided to edit a document if he did not agree with the majority of its content, this is evident in the fact that previous scribes edits were largely left unaltered. This also justifies leaving aspects that could assist in his assertion of Edward IV's right to kingship off the roll. One aspect that could have helped establish Edward IV's right to kinship is conquest, which has been cited to claim legitimacy for rulers' succession in other instances.²¹ Although blood succession is a preferable and a more recognised claim,²² the use of right of conquest in Edward IV's case was significant as Edward himself was successful at linking this conquest directly to God.²³ By doing this Edward helped to establish his own kingship by proclaiming whenever he won a battle that it was a sign of God's affirmation, suggesting that in God's eyes he was the rightful heir.²⁴ The primary and most probable reason for not helping to establish Edward IV's kingship through the right of conquest is that by adding this information to the roll, the Yorkist Scribe would also be justifying Henry IV's right of kingship. Henry IV was also successful in his conquest of England, gaining control over the majority of central and eastern England in only a month.²⁵ Therefore, the addition of this information to the Canterbury Roll would have not helped in

²¹ Given-Wilson, "Legitimation, Designation and Suggestion to the Throne in Fourteenth-Century England", 89.

²² Ibid., 89.

²³ Hicks, Edward IV, 1.

²⁴ Ibid., 1.

²⁵ Saul, Nigel. *Richard II*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 411.

the Yorkist Scribes goal to delegitimise the Lancastrian line, which provides insight into why he chose to exclude this from his edit.

Overall, the Yorkist Scribe's opinion about kingship can be considered to be quite clear. He believed that to hold kingship, one must first be the legitimate heir to the throne one occupies. Therefore, the legitimate king could not be someone who gained their right through usurpation. His ideas of kingship reflect significantly the ideas of the hereditary right of succession and that God gave a king's right to rule. These ideas display a significant motivation for the Yorkist Scribe's decision to adjust specific aspects of kingship on the roll that did not comply with his personal views.

Chapter Three: The idea of Succession and the Creation of the Yorkist Genealogy.

When considering the Yorkist Scribe's genealogy, it is essential to remember that this manuscript once started as a Lancastrian document. It was then adapted by the Yorkist Scribe to create his genealogy, adding thirty-two roundels to the current lineage and twelve new pieces of commentary. Through a detailed analysis of this manuscript, the way that the Yorkist Scribe differs from the Lancastrian Scribe in the creating of his genealogy and dealing with the idea of succession will be examined, along with the Yorkist Scribe's goals in creating this genealogy. This analysis on the way the Yorkist Scribe creates his genealogy and deals with the idea of succession will help to determine the broader significance behind his decision to turn a once Lancastrian genealogy into one that legitimised the Yorkist line of succession. This determination will in turn provide insight in the Yorkist Scribes motivation and objectives behind his edit on the Canterbury Roll.

One of the key differences between the Lancastrian and Yorkist Scribes when creating their genealogies is their visual imagery on the Canterbury Roll. The Yorkist Scribe's use of colours on the roll is a prominent feature that needs to be taken into account when considering the way, the Yorkist Scribe constructed his genealogy. The use of these colours shows a distinct departure from the Lancastrian Scribe's work, through the Yorkist Scribe's decision to ignore the current alternating blue and red central line used to claim the succession of both the English and French crown since Edward III. By doing this, he was choosing to neglect Edward III's claim to the French throne through his mother Isabella of France and his grandfather Philip the Fair, King of France (CRC120). Instead, the Yorkist Scribe decided to return to a red central line to show solely English kingship and succession, forsaking the blue which represented the kings' right to the French crown. This decision is a stark contrast to the Lancastrian Scribe's work to show French and English succession

visually. In the Yorkist Scribe's commentary, however, the claim of French succession is noted in six of the twelve fragments added to the roll illustrating that the Yorkist Scribe had no intention of ignoring the right to French succession of his Yorkist King, Edward IV. This suggests his decision to return to a red central line was done for another reason, which may be to visually differentiate his Yorkist King from the Lancastrian line of succession, a line of succession the Yorkist Scribe claims gained the throne through usurpation (CRC127). A key aspect in his commentary to consider when thinking about this would be the way the Yorkist Scribe refers to the central line, which he does on two occasions. The first states:

This blue and red line, placed in the middle, is unjust or incorrect, because he [who is] named Henry VI and his predecessors Henry IV and Henry V, violently and unjustly took upon themselves, and occupied the kingdom and the crowns of the kings of England and France (CRC128).

The second declares: "This red line is the true and direct line to the crowns of England and France, and Castile and León in Spain." (CRC132). In these fragments, the Yorkist Scribe is attributing different implications to these two lines, helping to differentiate them in his commentary. He does this by claiming that the red line is the true and legitimate line of succession, while the alternating blue and red line is incorrect. This claim that the red line is incorrect stems from the direct line of male succession being broken with the deposition of Richard II and the usurpation of his crown.¹ This implies that the Yorkist Scribe chose his colouring on purpose to make his line distinct from the line he is claiming is illegitimate, consequently, this would imply a similar goal to the Lancastrian Scribe when creating his genealogy, with both scribes intending to show a direct line of succession to their King. The

¹ Griffiths, *The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, 192.

main difference between these two works is that the Yorkist Scribe is trying to edit an already completed Lancastrian document. Therefore, it seems logical that his goal is to try to separate these two lines of succession in both his visual imagery and commentary.

An important consideration is what was happening in society during and immediately before the Yorkist and Lancastrian Scribes' edit on the roll. In this instance, this may shed some light on why the Yorkist Scribe does not seem worried about the time taken on this manuscript to ensure it flowed neatly. It is first important to understand the period when the Lancastrian Scribe was creating his genealogy. Ralph Griffiths proposes that the first issue the Lancastrian line of succession faced was the death of Henry V and the succession of his nine-month old son Henry VI.² This placed a strain on the Lancastrian line of succession with an infant king and placed pressure on Henry V's brothers, to ensure the safety of the Lancastrian succession through heirs of their own.³ Nevertheless, the first clear challenge to Lancastrian succession did not take place until thirty-eight years later in 1460.⁴ At a minimum, this is twenty-seven years after the Lancastrian genealogy emerges. What we can be sure of during the creation period of the Lancastrian genealogy, is that England had a child king, and, whilst it is not mentioned on the roll, one needs to be cognisant that his uncle, Thomas, Duke of Clarence had been killed in battle in 1421 with no heirs, leaving the Lancastrian line of succession in a more fragile position.⁵ The writing of this genealogy between 1429 and 1433⁶ also coincided with two crucial events during Henry VI's reign. The first being his coronation at Westminster Abbey on 6th November 1429, when he was only

² Griffiths, *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century*, 86.

³ Ibid., 86.

⁴ Edwards, *The Making of a Modern English State, 1460 – 1660*, 20.

⁵ Griffiths, *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century*, 86.

⁶ The Canterbury Roll Project. "Origins". Accessed October 2, 2019, <https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/Origin/>.

seven years old.⁷ The second coinciding with the middle of our timeframe when Henry VI undertook his second coronation in 1431 in Notre Dame cathedral in Paris.⁸ These events are crucial to understanding the political atmosphere and nature of society during the Lancastrian Scribe's edit, and expose the vast societal changes that had occurred before the Yorkist addition to the roll, between 1463 and 1468.⁹

The Yorkist Scribe's genealogy is written three years after Richard Duke of York submitted his claim to parliament for the throne of England and was rewarded the inheritance of the crown.¹⁰ By the following year, his son Edward assumed the position King of England, successfully removing the Lancastrians from the English throne.¹¹ This marked the end of the first battle of the Wars of the Roses¹² and showed the extremely diverse circumstances these Scribes were facing when they created their genealogies. The Lancastrian Scribe is not working in a society that has just been through a civil war to gain control of the English throne and the most problematic aspect of Lancastrian succession is passed over. Maree Shirota explains that the Lancastrian Scribe when faced with the deposition of Richard II and the change of dynasty chose not to offer a justification for it, rather ignoring it as though it was continuous succession.¹³ The Yorkist Scribe, on the other hand, is working in a society that has just been through a civil war and has undergone a dynastic transferal in power, which he is actively acknowledging. This escalated the urgency to verify the genealogical succession of the new Yorkist king, as it was imperative that the Yorkist monarchy was upheld by their precise and irreproachable claims to hereditary right, as pointed out by Alison

⁷ Dorothy Styles and C. T. Allmand. "The Coronations of Henry VI." *History Today* 32, (1982): 28.

⁸ Styles and Allmand. "The Coronations of Henry VI.", 32 – 33.

⁹ Shirota, "The Yorkist Revision," accessed September 19th, 2019, <https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/yorkist.shtml>.

¹⁰ A. P. Johnson, *Duke Richard of York 1411 – 1460*. (New York: Clarendon Press, 1988), 215.

¹¹ Hicks, *Edward IV*, 2.

¹² Edwards, *The Making of a Modern English State, 1460 – 1660*, 20

¹³ Shirota, 'Unrolling History: Fifteenth-Century Political Culture and Perceptions of the Canterbury Roll', 75.

Allan.¹⁴ Allan also refers to genealogies being used as a form of propaganda to help facilitate gaining the support of members of the nobility, gentry and educated commercial class during this time.¹⁵ These members of society's assistance would be of substantial use and practical benefit to Edward IV in his years after assuming the throne.¹⁶ The differing political climate these scribes were working in altered the urgency in the creation of their respective genealogies, which would consequently affect the time they took in the creation their genealogy.

From the Yorkist Scribe's work, it is clear that he did not take as much time in the drawing of the lines of his genealogy or the writing of his commentary from his messy handwriting and rushed and imprecise lines. If the Yorkist Scribe's goal in editing the Canterbury roll is to show a superior Yorkist claim, it is not surprising there is a lack of concern about neatness. The Yorkist Scribe's goal here is not to continue this genealogical manuscript in the same fashion, but rather to alter it to display whom he views as the rightful King. This may even be the reason that he decided to edit a Lancastrian genealogy rather than beginning another from scratch, as in this case, the Yorkist Scribe can create his genealogy a lot faster than he would have been able to if he had created another manuscript altogether. It also manipulates this manuscript and its genealogy to make out the Yorkist genealogical succession is stronger than the Lancastrians. By portraying this on a Lancastrian genealogy it allows it to seem not only legitimate, but also makes it justifiable, which in essence is what the Yorkist Scribe is aiming to achieve.

¹⁴ Allan, "Yorkist Propaganda: Pedigree, Prophecy and the "British History" in the Reign of Edward IV", 171

¹⁵ Ibid., 188 – 189.

¹⁶ Ibid., 188 – 189.

Another difference in the creation of the Yorkist Scribe's genealogy is shown through his decision to add thirty-two new roundels to this lineage that the Lancastrian Scribe did not see the need to include. This includes the Mortimer family who are of tremendous importance in promoting the Yorkist line of succession, which is arguably why the Lancastrian Scribe excluded them. This is due to Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March being Richard II's most credible heir in 1399 when he was removed from power.¹⁷ Edmund along with his father Roger, Earl of March and grandmother Philippa were excluded from the original Lancastrian genealogy. During the Yorkist edit they were added to the line of descent of Edward III, displaying Philippa as the niece of Richard II. The Lancastrians Scribe's purpose in leaving Philippa and her heirs off the roll is to avoid acknowledging any plausible heir to Richard II during the creation of this manuscript other than Henry IV. Although it is important to remember that Henry IV, unlike Edmund, offered the country an adult rather than a child for their King.¹⁸ The decision to leave Philippa and the Mortimer line off the Canterbury Roll during the creation of the Lancastrian genealogy is a strategic one. The Lancastrian Scribe's goal is to portray the rightful succession of the Lancastrian line, so ignoring another possible heir to Richard II, through his niece Philippa, is a logical step to take, even if this heir is only a child and doesn't offer the same security as an adult king.

The above discussion shows both the similarities and differences between the Lancastrian and Yorkist Scribes in the way they create their genealogy. Although they hold differing opinions about who should be displayed or added to their genealogies, they are both making these decisions deliberately to portray their Kings as the rightful successors. The deliberate decision made by the Yorkist Scribe to include Edward IV's Mortimer lineage as well as his

¹⁷ Griffiths, *The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, 192.

¹⁸ Tuck, *Richard II and the English Nobility*, 223.

lineage through Richard II's niece Philippa, allowed Edward to link himself with the likes of Llywelyn the Great¹⁹ and Edward III. Alison Allan points out that these ties with the Mortimer family gave him a valuable asset to use when claiming the succession.²⁰ Through this family tree, he was able to claim descent from the house of Gwynedd and its royal Welsh title.²¹ This title had been passed on to the Mortimers through Ralph Mortimer's marriage to Gwladys Dhu after the loss of the family's male line in 1378.²² The lineage that the Yorkist Scribe has created for Edward IV gives him a solid foundation to show his succession from past Kings of England and other noble houses. It is, however, remarkably similar to the work the Lancastrian Scribe had completed for his genealogy. In this circumstance, it would be safe to say that these scribes held the same goals but needed to follow differing paths to complete them. These differences include their opinions about who should be added or ignored in their genealogies to portray their kings as the rightful successors.

On the other hand, to understand how the Yorkist Scribe differed from the Lancastrian Scribe in the way he dealt with the idea of succession for the Yorkist line, it is important to consider who he is showing in his succession and what he covers. One of the most significant differences between these genealogies is that the Yorkist Scribe touches on a lot less than the Lancastrian Scribe. This includes the role of deposition in royal succession, which has been studied in depth by Maree Shirota. She suggests that the Lancastrian Scribe's work with deposition may reflect contemporary ideas about Kings who were not seen as suitable for their role.²³ Contrary to this, the Yorkist Scribe does not go into detail about the differing

¹⁹ Allan, "Yorkist Propaganda: Pedigree, Prophecy and the "British History" in the Reign of Edward IV", 179.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 179.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 179.

²² *Ibid.*, 179.

²³ Shirota, "Royal depositions and the 'Canterbury roll'", 60 – 61.

views of deposition or give any indication as to what these may be. Instead, he takes an extremely direct approach to the idea of succession, implying that because the Lancastrian King Henry IV violently deposed Richard II and that the entirety of the future Lancastrian line of succession is illegitimate (CRC127). This ignores the fact that at this time England had no legal way to dispose of an incompetent king, as no one in England, not even Parliament had power over a reigning monarch.²⁴ By implying that deposition may be a necessary evil to remove an incapable king, the Lancastrian Scribe is legitimising this action. While an opposing view is taken by the Yorkist Scribe, who shows a blatant disregard for the importance of a king's competence to rule, providing no indication that the removal of a reigning monarch for this reason is ever acceptable. This blatant disregard in a king's competence to rule is evident in the Yorkist Scribe's decision not to portray Henry VI as either an incapacitated or incompetent king on the roll as a way to build Yorkist support. Ten years before the writing of the Yorkist genealogy²⁵ Henry VI was considered to be extremely physically and mentally ill from August 1453 up until the end of 1454.²⁶ During this illness the Duke of York was named protector in the first protectorate, and although there is no certainty that this illness is the cause of the duke's second protectorate beginning October 1455, J. R. Lander argues this appointment indicates Henry VI was incapacitated.²⁷ This is based on parliament's decision to appoint Richard, Duke of York with identical terms to the ones he held during his first protectorate, when Henry VI can be confirmed as incapacitated.²⁸ These protectorates display that Henry VI was incapable of governing England without the help of the Duke of York, a fact, that was not used or manipulated by the Yorkist Scribe to gain Yorkist support. Instead, the Yorkist Scribe chose to build his

²⁴ Parker, "Roll Call: The motivations behind the inclusion of women on the Canterbury Roll", 51.

²⁵Shiota, "The Yorkist Revision," accessed September 19th, 2019, <https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/yorkist.shtml>.

²⁶ Ralph Alan Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI* (London: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1998), 715 – 717.

²⁷ Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, 718 – 726.

²⁸ Ibid., 718.

genealogy based on the violent deposition of Richard II by the Lancastrian King Henry IV, using this deposition as a basis to claim the illegitimacy of the Lancastrian line. By choosing to focus his genealogy this way, the Yorkist Scribe is unable to use the Duke of York's time as protector to his benefit. A comparison of the Yorkist and Lancastrian Scribes illustrates the different ways these scribes undertook creating their respective genealogy and the contradictory opinions they present in regard to their views of succession.

Overall, the Yorkist Scribe has a distinctly different way of creating his genealogy to the Lancastrian Scribe. Although they both have very similar goals and, in some instances, follow a similar method, the Yorkist Scribe does not attempt to create his genealogy in the same fashion that the Lancastrian Scribe did. What we can be sure of is that the Yorkist Scribe when editing this document did not want the Lancastrian line of succession in any way to appear legitimate and this is shown in the way he differentiates his Yorkist line from it. It also comes across in the time taken by the Yorkist Scribe to perfect his genealogy and his visual imagery on the roll.

Conclusion

The use of a comparative, textual and visual analysis between the work of the Yorkist Scribe and other scribal hands helps to determine the scribe's motivations and the objectives behind his edit. It is clear that the Yorkist Scribe's objective was not only to display a legitimate line of succession for the Yorkist line but also to delegitimise the Lancastrian line. His motivation in doing this is to ensure that the Lancastrian line of succession cannot be seen as a better option and with a little speculation to imply they lack the right to be able to return to the throne of England.

A comparison of the Yorkist Scribes authorial voice indicates that the Yorkist Scribe does not seem to be copying from chronicles or another chronicle roll. The use of comparison allows for the both the similarities and differences between these scribes' work to be distinguished; it also allows for the Yorkist Scribe's purposeful attempts to differentiate the visual aspects of Yorkist succession from the Lancastrian line to be uncovered. The purposeful attempt to differentiate the Yorkist line from the Lancastrian line of succession and his correction of ideas surrounding kingship, legitimacy and hereditary succession display the Yorkist Scribe's attempt to shape history to support his own cause. This is an area where further research could occur, as a way to build on this dissertation would be to look at Yorkist genealogical manuscripts that had been commissioned, in particular it would be interesting to look into one of the 'long Yorkist pedigrees' referenced to by Alison Allan, which have been written to both Latin and English.¹ Allan suggests that the differences seen between the Latin and English versions of these manuscripts is important due to the different audiences these manuscripts would have reached.² A comparison of these Yorkist genealogical roll to the

¹ Allan, 'Political Propaganda Employed by the House of York in England in the Mid- Fifteenth Century, 1450–1471', 272.

² Ibid., 273.

Canterbury Roll has the potential to provide not only an insight on Yorkist genealogies but also as to why the Canterbury Roll was able to be altered in the first place. Does the original manuscript contain the same ideas as other Yorkist genealogies, or does the Yorkist Scribe's work to edit this manuscript stand alone from other Yorkist genealogies in the ideas that it presents?

Nevertheless, the Yorkist edit on the Canterbury Roll provides a great deal of insight into the Yorkist Scribe's motivations and objectives. It is clear that the Yorkist Scribe felt the need to edit this manuscript to assert the right of the Yorkist line and to correct the concepts surrounding kingship and succession that did not conform to his own views and to supporting the Yorkist claim. He instead proclaims the importance of the hereditary right of succession and that a king's right to rule is provided by God. Overall, the Yorkist Scribe is making the conscious decision to purposely shape history in the manner that suits his own cause.

Bibliography

Primary

Jones, Chris., Chris Thomson, Maree Shiota, Elisabeth Rolston, Thandi Parker, and Jennifer Middendorf, ed., “The Canterbury Roll – A Digital Edition,” *The Canterbury Roll Project*. Accessed 25th September 2019. <http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll>.

Wall, A (ed.), *Handbook to the Maude Roll: Being a XVth Century MS. Genealogy of the British and English Kings from Noah to Edward IV., with a marginal history*, trans. A. Wall, Auckland, Whitcombe & Tombs Limited, 1919.

Secondary

Allan, Alison. “Yorkist Propaganda: Pedigree, Prophecy and the “British History” in the Reign of Edward IV,” in *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, edited by Charles Ross, 171–92. Gloucester: Rowman & Littlefield, 1979.

Allan, Alison. ‘Political Propaganda Employed by the House of York in England in the Mid-Fifteenth Century, 1450–1471’, unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Wales, 1981.

Allan, Allison. ‘Royal Propaganda and the Proclamations of Edward IV’ in *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 59, (1986): 146 – 154.

Burrow, John. *History of Histories*. London: Penguin, 2007.

Canning, Joseph. *A History of Medieval Political Thought, 300 – 1450*. USA, Canada: Routledge, 1996.

Cheney, C. R. and Michael Jones, ed. *A Handbook of Dates for Students of British History*.

Rev ed. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Chrimes, S. B. *Lancastrians Yorkists and Henry VII*. London: Macmillian & CO LTD, 1964.

Edwards, Philip. *The Making of a Modern English State, 1460 – 1660*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Hicks, Michael. *Edward IV*. Great Britain: Arnold, 2004.

Given-Wilson, Chris. “Legitimation, Designation and Suggestion to the Throne in Fourteenth-Century England.” In *Building Legitimacy: Political discourses and forms of legitimacy in medieval societies*, edited by Alfonso Anton, Hugh Kennedy and Escalona Monge, 89 – 105. Leiden: Brill, 2004. eBook Central.

Griffiths, Ralph Alan. *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century*. London: The Hambleton Press, 1991.

Griffiths, Ralph Alan. *The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Griffiths, Ralph Alan. *The Reign of King Henry VI*. London: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1998.

Johnson, P. A. *Duke Richard of York 1411 – 1460*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Jones, Chris. “The Canterbury Roll: A Case Study in a Contested Past.” Research seminar presentation, University of Canterbury, Christchurch New Zealand, 6 March 2019.

Jones, Chris, “The Canterbury Roll” in *Treasures of the University of Canterbury Library*, edited by Chris Jones, Bronwyn Matthews and Jennifer Clement, 85 – 90. Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press, 2011.

Kingsford, Charles Lethbridge. *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century: With an Appendix of Chronicles and Historical Pieces Hitherto for the most part unprinted*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1913.

de Laborderie, Oliver. “A new pattern for English History: The first genealogical rolls of the Kings of England.” In *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Medieval Britain and France*, edited by Raluca L. Radulescu and Edward Donald Kennedy, 45 – 62. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2008.

Lipton, Sarah. “Images and objects as sources for medieval history”, in *Understanding Medieval Primary Sources, Using historical sources to discover medieval Europe*, edited by Joel. T Rosenthal, 225 – 242. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Ormrod, W. Mark. *Edward III*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Ormrod, W. M. "Edward III (1312 - 1377) king of England and lord of Ireland." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Edited by Colin Matthew, Brian Harrison, Lawrence Goldman and David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23 Sept 2004. Accessed 28 September 2019. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.christchurchcitylibraries.com/10.1093/ref:odnb/8519>

Parker, Thandi. "Roll Call: The motivations behind the inclusion of women on the Canterbury Roll" unpublished BA Hons dissertation, University of Canterbury, 2016.

Parker, Thandi. The Canterbury Roll Project. "The Roman Numerals Scribe". Accessed August 27, 2019, <https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/romannumerals.shtml>

Pennington, K. "Law, Legislative Authority, and Theories of Government, 1150 – 1300." In *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought. c.350 – c.1450*, edited by J. H. Burns, 424 – 253. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.canterbury.ac.nz/10.1017/CHOL9780521243247>

Phillips, Seymour. *Edward II*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Rouse, Robert., 'Inscribing Lineage: Writing and Rewriting the Maude Roll', in *Migrations: Medieval Manuscripts in New Zealand*, edited by Samantha Hollis and Alexandra Barratt, 108-122. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007.

Saul, Nigel. *Richard II*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Shirota, Maree. “Royal depositions and the ‘Canterbury roll’”. *Parergon*, Vol. 32, No. 2, (2015): 39-61.

Shirota, Maree, “The Wars of the Roses,” published 2015, accessed 19th September 2019,

<http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/warroses.shtml>

Shirota, Maree. “The Yorkist Revision.” Accessed September 19th, 2019,

<https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/origin/yorkist.shtml>.

Shirota, Maree. ‘Unrolling History: Fifteenth-Century Political Culture and Perceptions of the Canterbury Roll.’ Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Canterbury, 2015.

Steel, Anthony. *Richard II*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1941.

Styles, Dorothy and C. T. Allmand. “The Coronations of Henry VI.” *History Today* 32,

(1982): 28 – 33. Accessed June 13, 2019

<http://ezproxy.canterbury.ac.nz/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=4863831&site=ehost-live>.

Taylor, Craig. “The Salic Law, French Queenship, and the Defense of Women in the Late

Middle Ages.” *French Historical Studies*, Vol 29 Issue 4 (2006): 543 – 564. Accessed

29 Sept 2019. doi: 10.1215/00161071-2006-012

Tuck, Anthony. *Richard II and the English Nobility*. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.

The Canterbury Roll Project. "Origins". Accessed 2 October 2019,

<https://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/Origin/>.

Ullmann, Walter. *Medieval Political Thought*. Great Britain: Penguin Books, 1970.